



Paper No. 9
COPY MAILED

AUG 20 2002

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

FENWICK & WEST LLP
TWO PALO ALTO SQUARE
PALO ALTO CA 94306

In re Application of:
Sweatt, *et al.*
Application No. 09/925,109
Filed: August 9, 2001
Attorney Docket No. 22407-05391

DECISION ON
PETITION

I. BACKGROUND

This is a decision on the July 10, 2002 petition, which is being treated under 37 C.F.R. §1.10(c), requesting that the above-identified application be accorded a filing date of August 8, 2001, rather than the presently accorded filing date of August 9, 2001.

II. THE RULE

37 C.F.R. § 1.10 *Filing of correspondence by "Express Mail."*

(a)...

(b)...

(c) Any person filing correspondence under this section that was received by the Office and delivered by the "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service of the USPS, who can show that there is a discrepancy between the filing date accorded by the Office to the correspondence and the date of deposit as shown by the "date-in" on the "Express Mail" mailing label or other official USPS notation, may petition the Commissioner to accord the correspondence a filing date as of the "date-in" on the "Express Mail" mailing label or other official USPS notation, provided that:

(1) The petition is filed promptly after the person becomes aware that the Office has accorded, or will accord, a filing date other than the USPS deposit date;

(2) The number of the "Express Mail" mailing label was placed on the paper(s) or fee(s) that constitute the correspondence prior to the original mailing by "Express Mail;" and

(3) The petition includes a true copy of the "Express Mail" mailing label showing the "date-in," and of any other official notation by the USPS relied upon to show the date of deposit.

(d)...

...

IV. ANALYSIS

Petitioner alleges that the application was deposited in Express Mail service on August 8, 2001. Petitioner states that a stamped copy of the Express Mail label is unavailable, but does not state why. In the alternative, Petitioner supplies a copy of a USPS.com tracking report. However, the pertinent data on this sheet is inexplicably redacted. Specifically, the Express Mail label number for this report has been "blacked out". The purpose of redacting that information is unknown. However, the redaction has rendered the tracking report useless, as there is no way of verifying which package this report tracks. It is also noted that even if the relevant information had not been redacted, the tracking report does not have any reference to the desired filing date, August 8, 2001.

V. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, *this petition is dismissed.*

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.10(c)".

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Box DAC
Washington, D.C. 20231

By FAX: (703) 308-6916
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Office of Petitions
Four Crystal Plaza, Suite 3C23
2201 South Clark Place
Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned in the Office of Petitions at (703) 306-5593.



Scott M. Ledford
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Assistant Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy